### CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

**Project Name:** The Removal of the 1902 Bridge-Fort Keogh

Proposed

Implementation Date: Winter 2011-2012
Proponent: Haass Construction

**Location:** Section 6 and 31 T 7N & 8N 47E-Yellowstone Riverbed

County: Custer

# I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

The purpose of this project is to remove the 1902 Bridge from the Yellowstone River do to structural damages.

# II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

# 1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED:

Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.

Fort Keogh-Agriculture Research Station

# 2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:

None

### 3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Alternative A- Allow the removal of the bridge.

Alternative B- No action

## III. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

- RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.
- Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.
- Enter "NONE" If no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.

# 4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE:

Consider the presence of fragile, compactable, or unstable soils. Identify unusual geologic features. Specify any special reclamation considerations. Identify any cumulative impacts to soils.

Alternative A- May cause some soil disruption along the bank of the river and within the riverbed. It may be eliminated following the removal of the 1902 bridge.

Alternative B-No impact

# 5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION:

Identify important surface or groundwater resources. Consider the potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality. Identify cumulative effects to water resources.

Alternative A- May decrease water quality if the soil is disturbed along the riverbank.

Alternative B- No Impact

#### 6. AIR QUALITY:

What pollutants or particulate would be produced? Identify air quality regulations or zones (e.g. Class I air shed) the project would influence. Identify cumulative effects to air quality.

Alternative A- Minimal pollutants may be produced from the large equipment used in the project. It should return to normal following the drilling.

Alternative B- No Impact

## 7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY:

What changes would the action cause to vegetative communities? Consider rare plants or cover types that would be affected. Identify cumulative effects to vegetation.

Alternative A- Minimal impact should occur. If disturbance does occur, The area should be reseeded with native wetland vegetation if disturbance does occur.

Alternative B- No Impact

# 8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS:

Consider substantial habitat values and use of the area by wildlife, birds or fish. Identify cumulative effects to fish and wildlife.

Alternative A-Wildlife disturbance may occur during the removal of the bridge. Once removed, wildlife should not be affected.

Alternative B- No impact

#### 9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES:

Consider any federally listed threatened or endangered species or habitat identified in the project area. Determine effects to wetlands. Consider Sensitive Species or Species of special concern. Identify cumulative effects to these species and their habitat.

Alternative A-There is no evidence of any sensitive species habitat in the scope of the project.

Alternative B- No Impact

### 10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:

Identify and determine effects to historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.

Alternative A-The Bridge is an old bridge that might have some historical value to the residents of Miles City, Montana. Because it might pose a safety hazard it should be removed from the river.

Alternative B- No Impact

#### 11. AESTHETICS:

Determine if the project is located on a prominent topographic feature, or may be visible from populated or scenic areas. What level of noise, light or visual change would be produced? Identify cumulative effects to aesthetics.

Alternative A- It will be removing a bridge from the river, aesthetics may be affected.

Alternative B- No Impact

# 12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY:

Determine the amount of limited resources the project would require. Identify other activities nearby that the project would affect. Identify cumulative effects to environmental resources.

Alternative A- No impact

### 13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA:

List other studies, plans, or projects on this tract. Determine cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of current private, state or federal actions in the analysis area, and from future proposed state actions in the analysis area that are under MEPA review (scoped) or permitting review by any state agency.

None

### IV. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

- RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.
- Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.
- Enter "NONE" If no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.

#### 14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY:

Identify any health and safety risks posed by the project.

Alternative A- There may be potential safety risks for laborers during the bridge removal, but the potential risk is minimal with proper safety efforts.

Alternative B- No Impact

### 15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:

Identify how the project would add to or alter these activities.

Alternative A- May reduce the ease of access across this portion of the river.

Alternative B- No Impact

### 16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT:

Estimate the number of jobs the project would create, move, or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to the employment market.

Alternative A- No impact

Alternative B- No Impact

#### 17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES:

Estimate tax revenue the project would create or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to taxes and revenue.

Alternative A- No impact.

Alternative B- No Impact

# 18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES:

Estimate increases in traffic and changes to traffic patterns. What changes would be needed to fire protection, police, schools, etc.? Identify cumulative effects of this and other projects on government services

Alternative A- No impact.

Alternative B- No Impact

# 19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS:

List State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, and other zoning or management plans, and identify how they would affect this project.

Alternative A- No Impact

Alternative B- No Impact

### 20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES:

Identify any wilderness or recreational areas nearby or access routes through this tract. Determine the effects of the project on recreational potential within the tract. Identify cumulative effects to recreational and wilderness activities.

Alternative A- No impact

Alternative B- No Impact

#### 21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING:

Estimate population changes and additional housing the project would require. Identify cumulative effects to population and housing.

Alternative A- No Impact

Alternative B- No Impact

# 22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:

Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

Alternative A- No Impact

Alternative B- No Impact

#### 23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:

How would the action affect any unique quality of the area?

Alternative A- This is an old historic bridge, removing it may have an effect on the view and uniqueness of the Yellowstone River.

Alternative B- No Impact

### 24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:

Estimate the return to the trust. Include appropriate economic analysis. Identify potential future uses for the analysis area other than existing management. Identify cumulative economic and social effects likely to occur as a result of the proposed action.

Alternative A- No impact

Alternative B- No impact

Prepared By: Name: Kimberly Haile Date: 12-9-11

Title: Land Use Specialist

V. FINDING

# 25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

Alternative A

#### 26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

Minimal and acceptable

#### 27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

EIS		More Detailed EA	X	No Further Analysis
EA Checklist	Name:	Marc Aberg	/s/ Marc A. Aberg	
Approved By:	Title:	Eastern Land Office; Land Program Manager		
Signature:			D	ate: